



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,180	04/14/2004	Shmuel Shaffer	062891.1251	6361
5073 7590 07/07/2008 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, KHAI N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/824,180

Applicant(s)

SHAFFER ET AL.

Examiner

KHAI N. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-42.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Ahmad F. MATAR/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's requests for reconsideration filed on June 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Non-Statutory Rejection for claims 27-40, Applicant has proposed an amendment to claims 27-40 to read that "a computer-readable medium encoded with logic". The claimed language "a computer-readable medium encoded with logic" appears to have no support in the instant application's specification.

Regarding the Art Rejection for claims 1, 15, 27 and 41 and their dependent claims, Applicant argues about the limitations recited in claim 1, that the reference Huang (US PAT 6,577,726) does not disclose, teach or suggest that "the endpoint concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions of one or more other users" (See page 13 lines 15-17 of Applicant's Remarks section).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument because Huang clearly discloses that the endpoint concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions of one or more other users (See Huang column 1 lines 30-33, and lines 37-40, i.e., implemented hoteling feature to share endpoints among multiple users "concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions", and see Fig. 1, Client 11-13 Hoteling Enabled). Huang also discloses the user can transfer a call and the information associated with the call to another user (See Huang column 1 lines 58-61). Therefore, the limitation "concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions" in claim 1 is anticipated by Huang. In addition, Zhao (US PAT 6,035,404) disclose the user can be concurrently logged onto the system (See Zhao - Figs. 1-2, Fig. 7, column 2 lines 9-13), and Marcus et al. (US PAT 5,933,488 hereinafter "Marcus") discloses an announcement system supports multiple telephone units (See Marcus Fig. 1, column 3 lines 1-4) and the audible announcement identifies the called party of the called extension (See Marcus - Fig. 1, column 3 lines 10-14, column 4 lines 33-40).

Independent claims 15, 27, and 41 recite limitations that are analogous to the limitations in claim 1. And therefore, claims 1, 15, 27, 41 and their independent claims 2-14, 16-26, and 26-40 are being unpatentable over Huang in view of Zhao, and in view of Marcus. Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintainable.

Regarding the Art Rejection of claim 42, Applicant argues that the cited portion of Huang's reference does not disclose "an endpoint concurrently supporting multiple extensions" (See page 15, line 3 of Applicant's Remarks section), no selection of a calling party and identifies the entered calling extension (See page 15, line 11 and lines 16-17 of Applicant's Remarks section).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument because for at least the reasons set forth above, Huang clearly discloses the endpoint concurrently supporting multiple extensions (See Fig. 1, Client 11, 13 Hoteling Enabled, Client 12 Without Hoteling, and see Huang column 1 lines 30-33, and lines 37-40, i.e., implemented hoteling feature to share endpoints among multiple users "concurrently supports an extension of the user and one or more other extensions").

Even when accepting applicant's argument that the cited portion discloses a user selecting a called party, the Huang's reference teaches the selection of a calling party and identifies the entered calling extension (See Huang - column 5 lines 55-60). Therefore, claim 42 is being unpatentable over Huang in view of Zhao. And therefore, the rejection is proper and maintainable.

Khai N. Nguyen

Phone (571) 270-3141